

DRAFT
Motorola
Community Information Group
Motorola 52nd Street Superfund Site Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2011 6:15 – 8:15pm
Gateway Community College, Phoenix, AZ

Project Team and Regulator Attendees:

U.S. EPA: Janet Rosati, Remedial Project Manager (RPM); Leana Rosetti, Community Involvement Coordinator (CIC); and Martin Zeleznik, RPM

Shaw Environmental, Inc. (Shaw): Lisa Stahl, Sue Kraemer

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality: Harry R. Hendler, Federal Projects Unit Manager; Wendy Flood, Project Manager (PM); Joellen Meitl, Hydrologist; Brian Stonebrink, PM; Delfina Olivarez, PM; and, Felicia Calderon, CIC

CIG Members:

Wendoly Abrego, Phoenix Revitalization Corp
Ruth Ann Marston, Phoenix Elementary School Board
Mary Moore, Lindon Park Neighborhood Association
Doug Tucker, Resident
Martha Brightenbach, Resident
Les Holland, Resident

Paul Johnson, ASU
Jennifer Botsford, Arizona Dept. of Health Services
Judy Heywood, Arizona Public Service
Barbara Murphy, Freescale consultant
Jenn McCall, Freescale
Tom Suriano, Freescale
Chris Legg, Malcolm Pirnie
David Gordon, Malcolm Pirnie
Matt Fesko, ASU
Rider Foley, ASU
Rolf Haden, PhD, PE, ASU
Krissy Russell-Hedstrom, TASC
Chuck Gordon, Terranext
Steve Brittle, Don't Waste Arizona
Ruth Tenreiro, Resident
David Abranovic, ERM
Walter Mikitowicz, RRD

Additional Attendees:

Todd Schwarz
Dennis Luz
Kevin Hadder, Resident
Candice Morrison, Resident
Matt Narter, Resident
Jerry Worsham, Resident, Attorney
Mario Castaneda, TAG advisor, Gateway Community College

The Community Information Group (CIG) meeting was held at the Gateway Community College in Phoenix, AZ from 6:15 to 8:15pm on January 26, 2011. Mario Castaneda called the meeting to order. Leana Rosetti, EPA Community Involvement Coordinator, opened the meeting with the suggestion of using an EPA contracted facilitator, Lisa Stahl based on feedback from the community interviews. Dr. Ruth Ann Marston seconded the suggestion. Ms. Rosetti then explained the role of the facilitator.

Lisa Stahl, reviewed the goals/purpose of facilitation approach. The goals and agreements from the CIG's September meeting were reviewed.

- A citizen asked what was the difference between the old Community Advisory Group (CAG) and the current CIG. Ms. Rosetti noted the transition of the CAG to the CIG was explained at the previous meeting – there were complaints about having to comply with the Arizona Open Meeting Law and how it restricted how the community wanted the meetings to go. Discussion ensued as to whether or not the CIG qualified under/was governed by the Arizona Open Meeting Law.
- It was asked, how often were we meeting with the CIG, 3 or 4 times a year? The meeting for the CIG would be quarterly.
- Pre-meeting informational sessions were discussed as an option to provide background to new attendees or interested parties.
- Mary Moore asked about advanced copies of CIG presentations. Ms. Rosetti indicated that given the nature of the technical presentations and to provide the most up-to-date information, oftentimes presentations are not completed until the day of the CIG. Ms. Rosetti indicated that to the extent possible, presentations will be provided in advance to the CIG members.
- Attendees were asked about a reasonable goal for the number of CIG members. It was agreed that anyone who agreed to be a CIG member would be considered as such up to twenty people, as the largest number ever on the CAG was twenty-one people. It was asked why designation of CIG members was important. Ms. Rosetti indicated that by having people sign up to be on the CIG, it makes it clear to her who she definitely needs to get in contact with regarding CIG business and distribution of detailed meeting materials.
- Dr. Marston commented that it would be most helpful for the meeting presentations to be available online following the meeting. This would make the information much easier to share with others in their communities.
- Meeting attendees were asked to think about the selection of co-chairs. Wendoly Abrego and Rena Chase-Dufault had volunteered as current co-chairs at the first CIG meeting. However Rena had not been able to attend the last few meetings. Ms. Rosetti clarified that while she is not a co-chair at this time, she would be willing to act as the government co-chair if that is helpful for the group. Ms. Abrego suggested the group approve that Ms. Rosetti be a co-chair as she had helped her considerably.

- Meeting attendees were asked as to how to pull others in their communities to attend the meetings. Wendoly Abrego suggested/volunteered publishing the meeting notice in the PRC newsletter. It was also noted that it was difficult to navigate through the agency web sites to find the meeting presentations. Ms. Rosetti acknowledged that it was difficult to find site-specific information on the web sites so asked if it would be better for her to send an email to CIG members with the link to the information; people agreed this would be very helpful.
- A meeting structure was suggested to the group for the format of future meetings to meet the intent of sharing information.

Ms. Rosetti provided an overview of the purpose and use of a Technical Assistance Grant (TAG). Mary Moore indicated for their TAG they are looking to replace Mario Castaneda, but he will assist until they find a replacement.

Ms. Rosetti introduced Krissy Russell-Hestrom to discuss the Technical Assistance to Services to Communities (TASC), which are available to the community as a contract through EPA. These services are for the community and intended to provide technical support to the communities so they can understand project documents and more effectively participate in the community involvement process. Ms. Russell-Hedstrom presented a PowerPoint slide program on the services and presented an example site, the Tucson Airport. Ms. Rosetti would be the contact if the group wanted to pursue this program.

Janet Rosati, EPA RPM, provided an update on the Soil Gas Sampling and potential Vapor Intrusion Study to be done in Operable Unit (OU) 1. The Soil Gas Sampling Work Plan for this study was presented to the community in a December meeting and community comments on the work plan can be submitted to EPA until January 28. The study is being done to assess if contamination has migrated from the former Motorola 52nd Street facility through the environment into the residential areas. . Contaminants in soil gas will be compared to screening levels that are protective of human health to determine if indoor air sampling is warranted.

- Mario Castaneda asked a question regarding the laboratories' detection limits. *Ms. Rosati indicated that they would be sufficiently low so that they could be compared to the soil gas human health screening levels (SGHSLs). She added that the sampling would be completed in two phases, with step-out sampling completed in the second phase after the review of the data.*
- A public member asked why he's never seen any sampling done just north of Red Mountain Freeway, where Brunson-Lee School and many mobile home parks are located. *Ms. Rosati indicated this area was covered by historical sampling. The upcoming sampling effort will cover the area north of the Red Mountain Freeway and the area near Brunson –Lee school. .*
- The question was asked as to how the indoor air sampling is done. *Sampling for indoor air uses a canister that draws in indoor air, which is then sealed and sent to a laboratory for analysis.*

Ms. Rosati also gave an update on OU3 project activities. The final stage of installing groundwater monitoring wells was completed. Data from the groundwater monitoring samples is

pending, and will be compared to historical results to see the status of the groundwater plume. Monitoring will continue until cleanup standards are met.

Break – reassembled 7:40 pm

Mr. Mario Castaneda provided an update on the use of Gateway Community college interns for technical support to both the Motorola 52nd Street and Phoenix Goodyear Superfund Sites.

Wendy Flood, ADEQ PM, gave an update on the End-Use Report. The report is available to the public at the information repositories. She recently received the report and did not have enough time to review it completely and prepare a presentation for this meeting. Ms. Flood welcomed any public comments to be submitted within the next 30 days so the agencies could take them into consideration during their review.

- A citizen made the comment, “It makes it difficult if it’s not readily available to people, yet the 30 day public comment period has started.” They would have appreciated a full briefing of the document tonight. *Wendy replied that the document is available at the repositories, at ADEQ records center and a copy of the report was displayed at the meeting as previously requested. This will not be the only opportunity for the community to comment. She wanted to give people a chance to comment now if they wanted to. At the next meeting she will be prepared to give a thorough report, at which time there will be another opportunity for the community to give their comments.*

Ms. Flood provided an update on the Bedrock Study currently underway. Data was received for the last 6 months and ADEQ will be meeting with Freescale in the next couple weeks to determine what the data indicates and evaluate the next steps for this study. A presentation on the reports will be provided at the March CIG meeting if the reports have been submitted by that time.

Ms. Rosetti gave an overview of levels of community involvement, the Superfund process and discussed this process in relation to the Motorola 52nd Street Site. Ms. Rosetti also identified short and long-term priorities/decision points related to the project. The following questions and comments were given:

- Do you put a limit on the technical impracticability waiver, to come back and look at the contamination after 5 or 10 years as technology advances? *Yes, it’s included as part of the Superfund 5-year review process.*
- Motorola is now two companies – which one is responsible for that site? *Motorola Solutions maintains responsibility for this contamination.*
- When two plumes co-mingle, one being from a Superfund Site and the other being a state WQARF site, does Superfund supersede the state at that point – does it become a Superfund issue? *No, they remain separate; however, data and information are shared between projects.*
- Martha Breitenbach asked for a map showing the combination of OUs 1,2 and 3 as well as the 56th Site to see where those plumes are. “People keep telling me they don’t co-mingle, but I find that hard to believe.”

- How long has the analysis of the ON water re-injection been going on and when will a decision be made? *Given the comment and review process, probably about 6 months before a decision will be made. The evaluation process has been going on for about a year and a half.*
- What is a ROD? *A Record of Decision that documents final and interim remedies, and EPA is the final signatory.*
- Why did you switch leads between the OUs? *The OU leads changed some time ago, we will have to look into it and let you know.*

Call to the Agencies/Call to the Public

Update on the Vapor Intrusion Study in OU2 by Martin Zeleznik, RPM for OU1 and OU2. EPA is moving forward with a vapor investigation of some homes near Kachina Joray, one of the smaller PRP sites located within OU2. At a previous public meeting here at the Motorola 52nd St. Superfund site, EPA said that if we found high levels of soil gas contamination that indicated a possibility of a short term health risk, we would aggressively move straight to an indoor air evaluation of residences. The high concentrations found in the soil gas sample results at the Kachina Joray site and our emergency response is an example of this commitment.

- What triggered this intrusion study as this has never been mentioned before? *Some new people were looking at the data and spotted some results that needed further investigation. At this time more information cannot be shared due to privacy issues with the residents.*
- What is a RPM? *Remedial Project Manager*
- Where is this place? Is this part of the Honeywell Site? *No, this site is not part of Honeywell, it is a small facility located near East Washington and 30th. It is near the facility currently occupied by Semiray.*

ADEQ has had some staff changes – Sherri Zendri has accepted another position within ADEQ and now Wendy Flood is the sitewide project manager for the Motorola 52nd Street Site as well as the project manager for OU1. Brian Stonebrink is the lead for OU2, and a new project manager for OU3, Delfina Olivarez.

Community Updates

- Question from the last meeting minutes – with the ongoing soil vapor intrusion, soil sampling, past sampling was done in 1992, correct? *Soil gas sampling was conducted in 1995. At that time, did they do soil gas and air sampling? No, indoor air sampling has never been done. Vapor intrusion is a relatively new pathway at EPA and our understanding of how vapor intrusion happens is evolving. EPA wrote guidance in 2002 and is now addressing vapor intrusion across the country. The people who live here, don't just live here for 24 hours, so I find 24 hours for indoor air analysis is very limited. How can you get enough air in that time? The level the 24-hour sample is compared to is based on figuring a person living in the same location for 350 days per year, allowing for*

vacation, and 24-hours per day, for 30 years. This is a human health risk-based screening level that provides for a very protective screening level.

- In the early days, there were several lawsuits filed that had soil gas data done by an outside firm. Is there any way to access that data? They did come through the neighborhoods and collect samples. *Not familiar with the lawsuits. All the available data from around 1983 was included in the remedial investigation.*
- Comments about lack of project progress were made by Steve Brittle. Mr. Brittle has been involved in the site since 1992. He indicated that there is a lot of available institutional knowledge about this site. Mr. Brittle commented, “The overarching question is that here we are two decades later, still plodding along in the remediation process.” Mr. Brittle expressed that he felt he was treated as a “second-class citizen” based on the request for community members sit at the front of the room and others to hold their questions until later. Mr. Brittle further commented, “This project has taken forever for progress to be made – there is something very wrong with this process that the contamination has not yet been addressed in a timely manner, people are still being exposed to contamination. People’s questions are not being answered when asked for basic project information and the truth,” where he was referring to *Final Evaluation Report, End Use Alternatives for Remediated Groundwater Report*. ADEQ had indicated that the report will be made available, but ADEQ had not had the time to complete their review to present at this meeting. He also did not understand why “the recent soil sampling cannot be discussed” referring to emergency response being conducted by EPA. Mr. Brittle felt the current approach for community involvement “is wasting people’s time due to the lack of information provided to the community through these meetings.” He is going to put his concerns and issues in a letter.
- Ms. Breitenbach commented on the soil gas information newsletter that was sent out – the information contained in this newsletter did not identify any responsible party, data results or anything. Rather than reassure, it raised concerns. She read that there was no concern, but it’s being investigated anyway.
- The other assumption is that we (the community) don’t understand technical information. That is not true and we do not appreciate being spoken down to. Ms. Rosetti indicated that she would appreciate and welcome suggestions on how to better communicate this information. The newsletter’s purpose was to announce the start of the investigation and invite people to a meeting to discuss the workplan for the investigation; therefore there was no data to report at that time.
- Les Holland repeated his previous concern regarding the deficiencies in the ADHS cancer registry. The report only documents cancer rates by current zip code of residents at time of diagnosis. It does not relate current cancer rates of people who have moved out of the area or who might have been exposed while working at or by air exhausted from the M52 site.

Action items:

- Wendoly Abrego to forward PRC newsletter publishing dates to Leana Rosetti.
- Leana Rosetti to send email to CIG contacts that contains hyperlinks for meeting materials posted to the agencies web sites.
- Martha Breitenbach requested a figure that shows the groundwater plumes for the 56th and 52nd Street Superfund Sites as she is interested in seeing how these plumes relate to each other.
- History of lead agencies for OUs 1, 2, and 3 will be discussed at the next meeting.

Agenda suggestions for next CIG meeting:

- End-Use Study Report
- OU1 Vapor Intrusion Study
- Kachina Joray update
- Bedrock Study update

The next CIG meeting will be March 23, 2011 at the Gateway Community College.